UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 10/517,797 | 12/13/2004 | Michel Gielis | P/4309-83 | 8972 |

20694 7590 08/11/2010

WOLFF & SAMSON, P.C.
ONE BOLAND DRIVE
WEST ORANGE, NJ 07052

| EXAMINER | |
|---|---|
| TANG, KAREN C | |
| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| 2451 | |
| MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
| 08/11/2010 | PAPER |

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

| Office Action Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | 10/517,797 | GIELIS, MICHEL | |
| | Examiner | Art Unit | |
| | KAREN C. TANG | 2451 | |

*-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --*

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *22 June 2010*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

4)☒ Claim(s) *13-33* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *13-33* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

- This action is responsive to the amendment and remarks file on 6/22/2010.
- Claims 13-33 are presented for further examination.

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Response to Arguments*

Applicant's arguments filed 6/22/2010have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that the art of records fails to teach "each peripheral device adopting at each instant an instantaneous status belonging to a plurality of possible statues, the controller being operative to periodically scan the peripheral device to read their instantaneous status"

Examiner disagrees

Crenella, discloses that the peripheral device (i.e., elevator cabs), is capable of providing device "instantaneous status" (e.g., indicators provided by the peripheral device such as service call request on or off), and such a "instantaneous status" is communicated wirelessly via network (refer to Col 2, Lines 10-15). Therefore, Crenella discloses the peripheral devices that are able to provide/configure/adopt various type of instantaneous stats (i.e., service calls).

Crenella further teaches that the controller are connected to those indicators (instantaneous status), thus, the controller is capable to receive the status message from each of the peripheral device, (see Col 2, Lines 45-50).

Crenella did not explicitly disclosing the controller is periodically scanning or receiving the status message from devices, however, Menard teaches the system in the adhoc environment, and in adhoc environment, between master (i.e., controller) and slaves (i.e., peripheral devices),

the master must periodically scan and probe the status of the slaves, therefore, in combination of Crenella and Menard, teaches the alleged missing limitation.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 13, and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Crenella et al hereinafter Crenella (US 6,601,679) in view of Menard et al hereinafter Menard (US 2002/0183008).

1. Regarding claim 13, Crenella teaches a system for remote status readings, comprising:

a communication network (column 2, lines 20-23 teach wireless communication network);

a central controller linked to the communication network (figure 2, element 24 teaches a controller); and a plurality of peripheral devices linked to the controller through the communication network (column 2, lines 8-11 and 42-57 teaches hall fixtures are connected to

the controller via wireless transceiver), each peripheral device adopting at each instant an instantaneous status belonging to a plurality of possible statuses, the communication network being operatively provided so as to link the peripheral devices to the controller by radio frequency means (column 2, lines 28-29 teach that the controller and the devices communication by using RF (radio frequency)), the peripheral devices being supplied with electrical energy (e.g., signals for communication) through the intermediary of the communication network (column 2, lines 42-45 teach electromagnetic energy are used for communication between controller and device).

Although Crenella disclosed the invention substantially as claimed, Crenella did not explicitly disclosing "the controller being operative to periodically scan the peripheral devices to read their instantaneous statuses"

Menard, in analogous art, disclosing "the controller being operative to periodically scan the peripheral devices to read their instantaneous statuses (refer to par 0041 and 0073)"

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teaching of Crenella with Menard since Menard's teaching of "the controller being operative to periodically scan the peripheral devices to read their instantaneous statuses" would improve Crenella's system by to control and manage devices having with unlimited geographic range interoperability with other devices and receive feedback indicating status of mode of operations.

2. Regarding claim 22, Crenella and Menard disclosed the system for remote status readings according to claim 13, Crenella further discloses wherein each peripheral device forms a command terminal for management of remote commands (column 2, lines 48-51 teach that the

device function as a command terminal where it transmitted a request to the controller regarding a call service.).

Claims 14-21, 23-27, and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Crenella et al hereinafter Crenella (US 6,601,679) in view of Menard et al hereinafter Menard (US 2002/0183008) in further view of Myer (US 5,850,416).

3. Regarding claim 14, Crenella and Menard disclosed the system for remote status readings according to claim 13.

Crenella teaches the limitation of claim 13 for the reasons above. Crenella teaches that in the wireless communication network the controller utilizes a transceiver for sending and receiving of electromagnetic signals (refer to Fig 2) and the transceivers comprises plurality of circuits and inductions loops (wireless device contains antenna in order to receive signals, and antenna is an inductor that contains inductor loops).

Although Crenella and Menard disclosed the invention substantially as claimed, Crenella and Menard did not explicitly disclose that "the induction loops are used for powering the peripheral devices."

Myer teach that the induction loops are used for powering peripheral devices (abstract and column 3 lines 30-45, "transceiver system in which first electromagnetic waves at 20KHz are transmitted form a single loop primary coil … to a plurality of device … having respective multi-turn secondary coils couple by an induction coupling to such primary coil to receive such wave which provide both operating power and signals for each devices")

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Crenella and Menard and Myer because Myer's teaching of "the induction loops are used for powering the peripheral devices." Would improve the system of Crenella by providing a reliable and durable usage of coil or inducing the electromagnetic energy known in the art.

4. Regarding claim 15, Crenella, Menard and Myer teach the system according to claim 14, as described above.

Crenella further teach that each peripheral device has its own identification code, the controller having a configuration memory in which are stored correlatively, for each peripheral device, the identification code of the peripheral device and a localization parameter identifying the location of the peripheral device in the network, the controller being operative to read, for each peripheral device, the instantaneous status and identification code of the peripheral device, with a result that each instantaneous status read is correlated, by the controller, to a location in the network (column 2, lines 49-57 and column 4, lines 39-40 Crenella et al. teach that the controller receives status from a device and response to the device with the device address. Column 5, line 67 teaches that the controller are implemented in a processor, it would be inherent for the processor to have a memory that stores the data it receives including the identification code/address of the devices. An Identification code would be associated with the device for the controller to be able to determine which device it received the device status and which device to sent the responds to.).

5. Regarding claim 16, Crenella, Menard and Myer teach the system according to claim 15, as described above.

Crenella further teach that the peripheral device includes a transmitter-receiver circuit and at least one status encoder adopting an instantaneous status constituting or participating in building up the instantaneous status of the peripheral device the status encoder being linked to the transmitter-receiver circuit to allow the peripheral device to transmit the instantaneous status of the encoder to the controller (column 5, lines 40-42 and 56-60 teach that the device status message is encoded and transmitted to the controller by the transceiver.).

6. Regarding claim 17, Crenella, Menard and Myer teach the system according to claim 16, as described above.

Crenella further teach that each peripheral device includes an electronic tag having a memory containing the identification code attributed to the peripheral device, a local antenna coupled to an induction loop of the communication network to receive the electrical energy transmitted by the induction loop, and the transmitter-receiver circuit, the transmitter-receiver circuit being linked to the local antenna so as to be able at least to receive from the controller a transmission order and to be able to transmit to the controller, apart from the instantaneous status of the encoder, the identification code of the tag (figure 6, elements 116 and 118 teaches antenna linked to the transceiver and column 4, lines 36-40 teach that the controller are aware of which device the status message are received from which implies that the address/ID were incorporated in the message).

7. Regarding claim 18, Crenella, Menard and Myer teach the system according to claim 16, as described above.

Crenella further teach that each peripheral device includes, as the status encoder, at least one appropriate element (column 4, line 14 teaches a call button).

8. Regarding claim 19, Crenella, Menard and Myer teach the system according to claim 18, as described above.

Crenella further teach that the appropriate element is an electric contact (column 4, line 14 teaches a call button).

9. Regarding claim 20, Crenella, Menard and Myer teach the system according to claim 16, as described above.

Crenella further teach that each peripheral device includes, as the status encoder, at least one sensor sensitive to influence of a physical parameter to which the peripheral device is subjected (column 4, line 14 teaches a call button).

10. Regarding claim 21, Crenella, Menard and Myer teach the system according to claim 16, as described above.

Crenella further teach that each peripheral device furthermore includes a display element (column 3, lines 52-55 teach crystal display or lanterns.)

11. Regarding claim 23, Crenella, Menard and Myer teach the system according to claim 16, as described above.

Crenella further teach that each peripheral device forms a call terminal for management of remote calls (column 4, line 14 teaches a call button).

12. Regarding claim 24, Crenella, Menard and Myer teach the system according to claim 23, as described above.

Crenella further teach that each peripheral device is installed at a specific location and forms a call terminal for a means of transport (column 4, lines 10-16 teach that the call buttons are located on each floor of a building and are being used within a transportation system.).

13. Regarding claim 25, Crenella, Menard and Myer teach the system according to claim 24, as described above.

Crenella further teach that each peripheral device is installed on a respective floor of a building and forms a call terminal for an elevator (column 3, lines 19-20 and column 4, lines 10-16 teach that the call buttons are located on each floor of a building and are being used within a elevator transportation system).

14. Regarding claim 26, Crenella, Menard and Myer teach the system according to claim 24, as described above.

Crenella further teach that the status encoder of each peripheral device includes a plurality of appropriate elements each of which identifies an assigned destination for the means of transport

from a departure position represented by the specific location (column 4, lines 59-64 teach the elevator car operating panel, it further teach that one of the element (button F1) represents the destination of lobby or first floor).

15. Regarding claim 27, Crenella, Menard and Myer teach the system according to claim 14, as described above.

Crenella disclosing the transceiver of each peripheral device includes local antenna coupled to an inductor loop to receive the electronic energy transmitted by induction loop (wireless device contains antenna in order to communicates, which contains induction loop)

16. Regarding claim 31, Crenella, Menard and Myer teach the system according to claim 14, as described above.

Crenella and Menard did not explicitly disclosing "wherein an electric power signal circulating in the series circuit has a frequency lower than 500 kHZ".

Myer, in analogous art, disclosing "wherein an electric power signal circulating in the series circuit has a frequency lower than 500 kHZ (abstract and column 3 lines 30-45, "transceiver system in which first electromagnetic waves at 20KHz are transmitted form a single loop primary coil … to a plurality of device … having respective multi-turn secondary coils couple by an induction coupling to such primary coil to receive such wave which provide both operating power and signals for each devices")"

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Crenella, Menard and Myer before them at the time the invention was made to modify the

controller systems of Crenella to use the induction loop to provide power to the devices as taught by Myer.

One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to make this modification since using coil/inductance loop to induce electromagnetic energy/power are reliable and durable and usage of coil for inducing electromagnetic energy are well know in the art.

Claims 28-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Crenella et al hereinafter Crenella (US 6,601,679) in view of Menard et al hereinafter Menard (US 2002/0183008) in further view of Myer (US 5,850,416) and Moslehi (US 6209480).

1. Regarding claim 28, Crenella, Adkins, Mabuchi, Face and Myer teach the system according to claim 27, as described above.

Crenella, Menard and Myer did not explicitly disclosing "the induction loop and the antenna are separately by the support."

Moslehi, in analogous art, disclosing "the induction loop and the antenna are separately by the support (refer to Col 28, Lines 29-40)"

It would have been obvious of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teaching of Crenella, Menard, Myer and Moslehi because by separating the inductor loop with antenna by a support such as dielectric material in order to prevent overheating the system.

2. Regarding claim 29, Crenella, Menard, Myer and Moslehi teach the system according to claim 28, as described above.

Crenella, Menard and Myer did not explicitly disclosing "the support is formed of a dielectric material."

Moslehi, in analogous art, disclosing "the support is formed of a dielectric material" (refer to Col 28, Lines 29-40)"

It would have been obvious of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teaching of Crenella, Menard, Myer and Moslehi because by separating the inductor loop with antenna by a support such as dielectric material in order to prevent overheating the system.

3. Regarding claim 30, Crenella, Menard, Myer and Moslehi teach the system according to claim 29, as described above.

Crenella, Menard, and Myer did not explicitly disclose "the support is formed as a partition."

Moslehi, in analogous art, disclosing "the support is formed as a partition (refer to Col 28, Lines 29-40 and Fig 26)."

It would have been obvious of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teaching of Crenella, Menard, Myer and Moslehi because by separating the inductor loop with antenna by a support such as dielectric material in order to prevent overheating the system.

Claims 32-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Crenella et al hereinafter Crenella (US 6,601,679) in view of Menard et al hereinafter Menard (US 2002/0183008) in further view of Myer (US 5,850,416) and Ghosh et al hereinafter Ghosh (US 2002/0024460).

4. Regarding claim 32, Crenella, Menard, and Myer teach the system according to claim 31, as described above.

Crenella, Menard, and Myer did not explicitly disclosing "wherein the electric power signal in the series circuit is modulated at 125 kHZ"

Ghosh, in analogous art, disclosing "wherein the electric power signal in the series circuit is modulated at 125 kHZ (refer to 0030)"

It would have been obvious of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teaching of Crenella, Menard, Myer with Ghosh. because Ghosh's teaching of "wherein the electric power signal in the series circuit is modulated at 125 kHZ" would improve the reliability of their systems by allowing the frequency to oscillates without endanger the stability of the antenna's tolerant level.

5. Regarding claim 33, Crenella, Menard, and Myer teach the system according to claim 14, as described above.

Crenella, Menard, and Myer did not explicitly disclosing "wherein the electric power signal in the series circuit is modulated between 500kHZ and 125 kHZ"

Ghosh, in analogous art, disclosing "wherein the electric power signal in the series circuit is modulated between 500kHZ and 125 kHZ (refer to 0030)"

It would have been obvious of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teaching of Crenella, Menard, and Myer with Ghosh because Ghosh's teaching of "wherein the electric power signal in the series circuit is modulated at 125 kHZ" would improve the reliability of their systems by allowing the frequency to oscillates without endanger the stability of the antenna's tolerant level.

***Conclusion***

**Examiner's Notes**: Examiner has cited particular columns and line numbers in the references applied to the claims above for the convenience of the applicant. Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings of the art and are applied to specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply as well. It is respectfully requested from the applicant in preparing responses, to fully consider the references in entirety as potentially teaching all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage as taught by the prior art or disclosed by the Examiner. In the case of amending the claimed invention, Applicant is respectfully requested to indicate the portion(s) of the specification which dictate(s) the structure relied on for proper interpretation and also to verify and ascertain the metes and bounds of the claimed invention.

Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Karen C. Tang whose telephone number is (571)272-3116. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Thr 8 - 6.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Follansbee can be reached on (571)272-3964. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Karen C Tang/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2451